

Remarks

Claims 2-12, 14-34, and 36-53 are at issue. Claims 2-8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 27-31, 34 and 36-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Launey et al (5,086,385) in view of Heltman (5,939,980). Claims 29-10, 20, 26 & 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Launey et al in view of Heltman and further in view of Joao (5,917,405). Claims 15, 17, 19, 23, 25 & 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Launey et al in view of Joao and further in view of Heltman. Claims 51 & 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Launey et al in view Heltman. Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Joao et al in view of Launey and further in view of Heltman.

The present application is a distributed home automation and security system that has a central intelligence attached through the PSTN to a number of homes. This reduces the cost associated with the home automation and security system and allows for greater intelligence in the central controller. The Examiner cites three patents: Launey is a general home security and automation system that does not show or suggest the distributed nature of the present invention. Heltmann is an automated "neighborhood watch system". It does not show or suggest the centralized controller and intelligence of the present invention. Joao describes a control system for cars that is not distributed and will not work in the present application. Joao is completely inapplicable to the present invention. The logical combination of Launey and Heltmann is a home controller and automation system that sends alarms to neighbors as well as the police or fire department. There is clearly no suggestion for the present invention. The Examiner has no legal basis for continuing to obstruct the allowance of this application and is wasting the time and money of the applicants.

Independent claims 2, 15-25, 28, 33, 34, and 51 all require the distributed hierarchical approach that is not shown in the prior art. All these claims are clearly allowable for the reasons stated above.

Claims 3-12, 14, 26, 27, 29-32, 36-50, 52, and 53 are allowable as being dependent from allowable base claims.

Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

(Bennett et al.)

By *Dale B. Halling*
Attorney for the Applicant
Dale B. Halling
Phone: (719) 447-1990
Fax: (719) 447-0983

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that a Amendment is being facsimile transmitted to the United State Patent and Trademark Office, Facsimile No.(703) 872-9314

3/10/05
Date

Dale B. Halling
Signature(Dale B. Halling)